DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 540 FL 009 956

AUTHOR Schwartz, Joan Lorraine
TITLE Repair in Conversations between Adult Second Language Learners of English.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 88p.; Master's Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Body Language; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Discourse Analysis; *English (Second Language); *Error Analysis (Language); Interaction Process Analysis; Language Instruction; Language Proficiency; Language Research; Language Skills; Language Usage; Masters Theses; Paralinguistics; Phonology; Pragmatics; *Second Language Learning; *Speech Communication; Syntax; Vocabulary
IDENTIFIERS Conversation; *Error Correction (Language)

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the ways adult second language learners deal with errors and trouble sources in their conversations with one another. Specifically, it describes the repair work done by the second language learners, the extralinguistic features accompanying these repairs and the differences between repairs made by speakers at different proficiency levels. In addition, the repairs made by second language learners of English are compared with repairs made by native speakers. The data were collected from three videotaped conversations between pairs of friends with varying language backgrounds and proficiency levels. Analysis of these conversations showed that the repair work done by the adult second language learners was similar to repairs done by native speakers. However, corrections of beginning second language learners were the outcome of incompetence in phonology, syntax and lexicon. Extralinguistic features were significant in terms of facilitating the process of negotiation for understanding. The three conversations differed significantly according to the students' proficiency level, especially in the pace and length of the repair operations. In general, the data indicate that adult second language learners are able to deal with errors and trouble sources and to learn specifics, such as vocabulary, as well as conversational strategies from conversing with one another. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162540

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Repair in Conversations Between Adult Second Language Learners of English

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirement for the degree Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language

by

Joan Lorraine Schwartz

1977

FL009958

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan L. Schwartz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

10-28-99 FLOO[redacted]9958

© Copyright by Joan Lorraine Schwartz, 1977

The thesis of Joan Lorraine Schwartz is approved.

Diane Larsen-Freeman

Diane E. Larsen - Freeman

Claudia I. Mitchell-Kernan

Claudia I. Mitchell - Kernan

Evelyn R. Hatch

Evelyn R. Hatch, Committee Chairman

University of California, Los Angeles

1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. METHOD	7
Students	7
Data Collection	9
Data Transcription	10
3. DESCRIPTION OF THE VERBAL REPAIRS IN THE L2 DATA	11
Classification of the Data	11
Self-Initiated Repair	11
Other-Initiated Repair	16
4. EXTRALINGUISTIC FEATURES ACCOMPANYING REPAIR	28
Extralinguistic Features Accompanying Self-Initiated Repair	31
Extralinguistic Features Accompanying Other-Initiated Repair	37
5. DIFFERENCES AMONG THE THREE CONVERSATIONS	41
Natasha and Ming	43
Teresa and Farokh	46
Hamid and Mari	48
6. COMPARISON OF THE L1 AND L2 DATA	55
L1 Description	56
L2 Description	60
7. CONCLUSION	66
Statement of Findings	66
Discussion	68
Directions for Future Research	71
FOOTNOTES	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	76
APPENDICES	79

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Repair in Conversations Between Adult
Second Language Learners of English

by

Joan Lorraine Schwartz
Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language
University of California, Los Angeles, 1977
Professor Evelyn R. Hatch, Chairman

Difficulties frequently arise in conversations between second language learners. This study was conducted to investigate how adult second language learners deal with errors and trouble sources in their conversations with one another. The specific aims of the research were to describe the repair work done by the second language learners in discourse, to describe the extralinguistic features which accompanied these repairs, to describe the differences between repairs made by speakers at different proficiency levels, and to compare the description of repairs made by second language learners of English with a description of repairs made by native speakers.

Three videotaped fifteen minute conversations of pairs of friends from varying language backgrounds and proficiency levels were collected. The beginning students were Persian and Japanese, the intermediate students were Persian and Mexican, and the advanced students were Russian and Chinese. The audiotapes were transcribed according to conversational analysis transcription techniques. The

segments with repair were transcribed again from the videotapes for the extralinguistic features, according to a system of detailed glosses.

The data showed that the verbal repair work done by the adult second language learners was very similar to repairs done by native speakers of English. However, unlike adult native speakers, when one beginning second language learner corrected the other, the corrections were the outcome of incompetence in phonology, syntax, and lexicon. Extralinguistic features were significant in the repairs, in terms of facilitating the process of negotiation for understanding. The three conversations differed significantly according to the students' proficiency level, especially in the pace and the length of the repair operations.

In general, the data indicate that adult second language learners are able to deal with errors and trouble sources in their conversations with one another, and that the students are able to learn specifics (such as vocabulary) as well as conversational strategies (such as negotiation) from conversing with one another.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Recently conversational analysis has been suggested as a workable methodology for studying second languge acquisition (Daden, 1975; Hatch, 1976). Conversational analysis enables us to look at both the form and function of the language being learned in naturally-occurring conversation, and provides us with a framework within which to look at a variety of conversational strategies employed by the learner. In particular, conversational analysis offers a framework to look at how second language learners deal with errors and trouble which arise in their conversations with one another.

Conversations between native speakers of English have been analyzed by conversational analysts Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), and conversations between native speakers of Thai (Lue) by anthropologist Moerman (1972). Research is also being conducted on conversations between adult native and non-native speakers of English (Hatch, Shapira and Wagner-Gough, 1975; Gaskill, 1977). Although conversational interactions between non-native speakers of Spanish have been briefly described (Jordan and Fuller, 1975), there has been no research, to my knowledge, conducted on conversations between non-native speakers of English.

Conversational analysis, in dealing with units of discourse rather than just sentential units, allows researchers to examine the function as well as the form of the language being learned

in communication. Wagner-Gough (1975) has pointed out the importance of studying both the form and the function of language in use, noting that her subject, Homer, employed the progressive form "-ing" long before he learned its correct function. The importance of the function of language for communication in relation to the correctness of form is well illustrated by one of the second language learners in my research. Although Teresa converted the correct form in the model to an incorrect form, the function of her utterance remained clear to her interlocutor:

(Teresa and Farokh, p. 5)
Farokh: You look nice today. Where did you buy your clithes?
Teresa: Where did I buyed it?
Farokh: Yes.

(Refer to the transcription key in the appendix.)

If we assume that communication and interaction are the goals of the learner, we must look at not just the production of the learner in isolation, but at the input as well. Speech utterances can be considered in terms of correctness only in context. Since much of the speech in communication involves negotiation, it is difficult to isolate one person's sentence for analysis, without examining its relation to other sentences in the conversation, including the input from other participants (such as in the collaborative completion of sentences). Thus, it is difficult to identify sentential errors, without considering the function of a turn in the context of its input.

Second language learners of English do not always receive all of their input from native speakers of the target language, even in

the target language community. In fact many second language learners in the United States rarely speak English with native speakers of English. Rather, many learners use English as a "lingua franca" with other non-native speakers of English at work, in their neighborhoods and in their E.S.L. classrooms. Much of the input to the learner comes from other second language learners and this input should be considered in second language acquisition studies.

The production of, and input to, native speakers of English have been examined by conversational analysts in the field of sociology, (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1974, 1977), in order to describe the form and function of language in discourse units. They have described the organizational features of naturally-occurring conversation and rules for how native speakers of English deal with trouble in conversation and its organization through "repair." They offer a useful definition of repair:

> ...the organization of repair is the self-righting mechanism for the organization of language-use in social interaction. If language is composed of systems of rules which are integrated, then it will have sources of trouble related to the modes of their integration (at the least). And if it has intrinsic sources of trouble, then it will have a mechanism for dealing with them intrinsically. An adequate theory of the organization of natural language will need to depict how a natural language handles its intrinsic troubles. Such a theory will, then, need an account of the organization of repair. (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, 1977, p. 34)

Repair, then, is a "self-righting mechanism," which deals with problems in the interaction. Repair holds a large, in fact omnipresent part in conversation. It encompasses the concept of "correction," that is the replacement of an "error" by what is

"correct." But repair does not deal just with errors, nor with replacements. Repair/correction can occur when there is no audible error and an audible error does not always result in repair/correction.

Repair is a strategy for achieving understanding when there is some kind of breakdown or trouble, or some is anticipated. Repair may be initiated either by the speaker of a trouble source or by the other speaker. It may then be repaired by the speaker of the trouble source or by the other speaker. There is also evidence (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977) that self-repair occurs more frequently than repair made by the other person ("other-repair") and that the organization of repair favors the use of self-repair over other-repair.[1]

Breakdowns in understanding occur frequently in conversations between native speakers of English, as anything which is said may be a potential trouble source. Second language learners are faced with an additional burden to interaction: an imperfect command of the language of communication. Indeed, it is remarkable that second language learners, who share a language imperfectly spoken, can deal with errors and trouble sources in their conversations and can communicate at all.

Learners' errors have been looked at in many ways by researchers; as sources of information for the learner, for the teacher, and for the researcher. Researchers in second language acquisition have been mainly concerned with how and why errors are

made by the learner, but not with what happens to the error after it has been made. There has been some research on correction in the classroom, although usually correction by just the teacher (Allwright, 1975; Chaudron, 1977). There has also been research on the learner's ability to identify errors in his compositions (Robbins, 1977) and in taped samples of his speech (Schlue, 1976). But little research has been conducted on how errors and other trouble sources are dealt with by second language learners in naturally-occurring conversations.

To deal with errors and trouble sources in their interaction, second language learners have two resources for communication; both linguistic and extralinguistic behavior. Extralinguistic behavior has been shown to be important, not only as a communicative resource, but also as a factor in determining and even changing the syntax of an utterance (Goodwin, undated mimeo). A description of the extralinguistic features accompanying repair is therefore necessary to explain how repair is accomplished, as well as to enrich and vary the present description of repair.

My research attempts to look at how second language learners deal with problems in their conversations with each other. Specifically, the following research questions were investigated:

1. In L2 - L2 adult interaction do self-repairs and other-repairs follow descriptions of repair in L1 interaction?

2. What kind of extralinguistic features accompany self-repairs and other-repairs of L2 learners?

3. Does the proficiency level of the students make a difference in the type of repair which is done?

In order to address these questions, conversations between adult second language learners were recorded. The students, the data collection, and the transcription methods are described in Chapter 2. In Chapter 3 the verbal repairs made by the E.S.L. students in these conversations are described. The extralinguistic features which accompanied the students' repairs are discussed in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 deals with the differences among the three conversations. Data on repair for native speakers and my data on repair for second language learners are compared in Chapter 6. Finally, some concluding remarks regarding future research possibilities are offered in Chapter 7.

Chapter 2

METHOD

Students :

Data was collected from six students as they conversed in pairs. In trying to find second language learners for whom English would be the natural language of communication, I selected students for each pair who were from different language backgrounds. Another important consideration in the selection of the students was that each pair be friends. In this way, the students had already selected themselves as partners in conversation, and in continuing to meet, had apparently achieved some success in communication. Another factor which was involved in the students' selection was their proficiency level, as determined by their placement into E.S.L. classes at U.C.L.A. The hope was to attain data as rich in variation as possible. Therefore, each conversation was composed of two friends from the same language proficiency level. The first conversation was between two beginning students, the second between two intermediate students, and the third between two advanced students.

With these considerations in mind, I chose two friends from my own E.S.L. class, which is a high intermediate/advanced class at U.C.L.A. I also approached teachers of a low intermediate class, and a beginning class, and asked them if there were any friends in their class from different language backgrounds.

The two beginning students were Hamid, a Persian male,

and Mari, a Japanese woman. Hamid was thirty years old and studied architecture at U.C.L.A. He had arrived in the United States one month before this research and planned to stay until he finished his studies, when he would return to Iran. Hamid had studied English for eight years in high school and at the university in Iran. He lived with his wife and spent most of his time with her or other Persians.

Mari was twenty-eight years old and had arrived in the United States two months before this study. She worked for a design company in Tokyo and came to the United States to learn English. She planned to return to Japan after four months.

The two friends from the intermediate class were Farokh, a man from Iran, and Teresa, a Mexican woman. Farokh was twenty-eight years old and studied chemical engineering as an undergraduate student at U.C.L.A. He had been in the United States for eight months and had studied English for six years in high school. He was unmarried and lived with his cousin. He spent most of his free time with his Iranian friends and relatives and used English only when he had to. Farokh wanted to return to Iran when he finished his studies.

Teresa was twenty-two years old and had only been in the United States for one month. She had studied English for one year in Mexico. Teresa was married and lived with her husband, who was studying towards a Ph.D. Teresa herself had a B.A. in economics from Mexico and wanted to continue her studies towards an M.A. She came to the United States because her husband wanted to study at

U.C.L.A. She wanted to return to Mexico when he finished.

The friends from the advanced class were Natasha, a Russian woman, and Ming, a woman from Taiwan. Natasha was eighteen years old and she was a freshman at U.C.L.A. She had immigrated to the United States from Russia with her parents and her brother a year and a half before this study. She attended a year of high school in Los Angeles. Her father was a dentist and Natasha was majoring in biology in order to attend medical school. She had studied English for four years in Moscow.

Ming was also eighteen years old and a freshman at U.C.L.A., majoring in physics. She had started studying English in Guam and Taiwan for two and a half years before she arrived in California. Her family had also immigrated to the United States from Taiwan a year and a half before this study. She attended high school in Los Angeles for one year.

Data Collection:

I asked permission of each pair of students to videotape them while they were conversing. I then took them to a room with chairs set up next to each other across from the videocamera. I requested that they spend their class break there until I returned in twenty minutes. Thus, no topics were proposed by me. I left them alone with the videocamera running and actually returned in fifteen minutes.

Data Transcription:

After collecting the three audio- and videotapes, I transcribed the audiotapes according to conversational analysis transcription techniques developed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson.[1]

In this method, pauses and overlapped speech are transcribed carefully (refer to the transcription key in the appendix for the symbols). The transcription of the visual behavior was more difficult because as yet there is no universal transcription method. After locating the repair segments in the transcripts of the audio data, I then transcribed these segments once again from the videotapes, using a system of detailed glosses, which I developed for the purposes of this research. Although I tried to be as accurate as possible in affixing the onset time of the extralinguistic features to the corresponding speech, this system is inadequate for more than just basic observations.

Chapter 3

DESCRIPTION OF THE VERBAL REPAIRS IN THE L2 DATA

Classification of the Data

Repair in conversations is normally the outcome of a negotiation between the speaker and listener in order to achieve understanding. Sometimes, however, efforts for repair fail and the trouble is not "fixed," e.g.,

1) (Ming and Natasha, p. 11)
Ming: it's a bow-bow something (.1) man's constant,
I think that's what they call it.
Natasha: Yeah, but the name yeah I'm not sure about the
name, but it's a constant.

In this word search, the word was not "found" and thus a successful repair as an outcome of the interaction did not take place. But the effort for the process of repair undeniably occurred. It is evident that there is an important distinction between the initiation of a repair and its completion, whether successful or not.

However, in analyzing the data, it became apparent that the most productive means of classifying repair would not be in terms of successful or unsuccessful outcomes, but would rather include the distinction of self-initiated from other-initiated repair, as well as that of self-repair from other-repair, a basic distinction discussed by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977).

Self-Initiated Repairs

Placement:

In self-initiated self-repairs the person who utters the trouble source is also the one to initiate repair on it and then to complete

the repair, usually in the same turn, e.g.,

2) (Hamid and Mari, p. 8)
Hamid: .h that uh i- i- that was a (1.2) uhh it has uhh a bar.

The repair itself may be immediate, e.g.,

3) (Hamid and Mari, p. 6)
Hamid: Uh you uh could you uhh see (.6) uhhh <u>all</u> the places?

or it can be delayed until the transition space of a turn, e.g.,

4) (Natasha and Ming, p. 4)
Ming: But the test will be on that, too. I mean (.2) today's quiz.

Initiator Techniques:

The second language learners used various techniques to signal the initiation of self-repair, including lexical means such as "I mean" and "you know," and nonlexical means such as "uh's," sound stretches, cut-offs and pauses, although not every occurrence of these items signalled a repair-initiation.

All of the speakers frequently interspersed their talk with "you know's." This was often just a colloquial expression used as a conjoiner for an expansion, e.g.,

5) (Natasha and Ming,p. 7)
Ming: I think it's uh good practice, you know, for what we do.

or as a sort of tag question, e.g.,

6) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 1)
Teresa: Yeah I think we have to get the meaning (.2) ya know.

But "you know" was also used as a signal of potential repair initiation. "You know" kept the flow of the talk going while the speaker looked for better words to express his meaning. These "you know's" did a fabulous job of filling gaps and stalling for

time. They signalled to the auditor to be patient; that the "repaired" expression was coming right away, e.g.,

7) (Natasha and Ming, p. 17)
Natasha: Becuz I- I wanna take like (.4) you know I wanna take something to- to make ya know just (.2) to have fun.

8) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 14)
Farokh: Now (.2) you know, now man and w- w- w- man and woman are the s- (.) you know are the same and they can (.) take a (permission) and (.) they ask for permission.

Nonlexical means were also used to signal potential self-initiated repairs. Perhaps the most common of these were "uh's." "Uh" turned out to be especially significant when examined in combination with the extralinguistic features involved (to be discussed in Chapter 4). "Uh" also seemed to function as a linguistic space-holder, so that a gap would not occur in the middle of a turn constructional unit, while the speaker took time to "monitor" his speech, or conduct a "mini-word search", e.g.,

9) (Hamid and Mari, p. 6)
Hamid: Uh you uh could you uhh see (.6) uhhh all the places?

10) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 19)
Teresa: I went to the advisor and they told me that (.) I uh (.4) we have to have better enroll better uh relationship with ( ) to study that.

Sound stretches, the elongation of segmental phonemes, were also employed to signal possible repair-initiation, e.g.,

11) (Brunak, Fain, and Schwartz: Jose and Vinh, p. 6)

Jose: How you take- uh how you uh (.2) ho:w you:: uh (.2) you ha- you take you:: driver's license?

Cut-offs are words which have not been fully articulated; their endings are cut off abruptly, sometimes with a glottal stop.

Natasha cut off the endings of her words quite often, which made her speech seem very choppy and nonfluent, e.g.,

12) (Natasha and Ming, p. 4)
Natasha: (.2) Uh (.2) I'm not sure (.8) yeah, I have t- (.6) I have few minutes before the- I have to go over the limits and uh (.2) their quotient rules all those rules.

13) (Natasha and Ming, p. 4)
Natasha: .hh yeah but you know what (.) I always have a pro- some kind of problems after school.

Pauses were another nonlexical means of signalling potential self-initiated repair, although pauses serve other important functions in conversations as well. In the following example cut-offs, uh's, and pauses all work together as techniques to initiate repair:

14) (Hamid and Mari, p. 8)
Hamid: .h that uh i- i- that was a (1.2) uhh it has uhh a bar.

Operations During Repair:

In addition to techniques used for initiating self-repairs, there are various operations which take place during the repair. These include word replacements, in which one item is replaced by another;

15) (Hamid and Mari, p. 3)
Mari: We talked about this school- university (.) mm and aftah (.2) we went to- (.) umm to Bebery Hills?

reordering, in which a unit is stopped before completion and the insertion of a new item necessitates a reordering of the clause;

16) (Natasha and Ming, p. 18)
Natasha: Wha- What kind of English do they- what do they say?

and word search, in which a word is not available when it is "due."

Word search emerged as a very interesting category of self-initiated repair in the second language learners' conversations. The above examples were all of self-initiated repair which resulted in self-repair. Word searches, as self-initiated repair, resulted in both self- and other-repair. For native speakers, word search usually involves the search for a person's name, e.g.,

(17) (Daden, 1975, p. 87)

Native speaker: Yesterday I ran into uhh (.5) what's his name (.5) Carl.

On the contrary, the word searches in the conversations between the second language learners involved a frequent search for all kinds of vocabulary items; vocabulary seemed to be a much more common trouble source. This is to be expected for second language learners, since it takes a long time to learn such varied vocabulary to equip them for all situations. Noting the prevalence of word searches, we can appreciate the concern of most E.S.L. students for learning the exact word for a concept, and for memorizing long lists of vocabulary. After looking at examples from the data, it is not difficult to imagine the frustration which must be felt when a "simple word" is not available when it is needed. This is especially evident from the extralinguistic features (to be discussed in Chapter 4).

The word searches were constructed in such a way that the speakers really conferred with their auditors to come to terms about connecting an exact word with a meaning. The speakers used a wide array of strategies, including synonyms, definitions, and examples.

Many times the speaker actually asked the auditor for the word directly, e.g.,

18) (Natasha and Ming, p. 12)
Natasha: ...foundation an and you know some metals and you- you study their (1.) .hh uh their- what (.2) how do you say? y' know when they react (.2) how they react to different substances.
Ming: I don't know.

Usually when the word searches were long, the word was never found, perhaps because it became unnecessary with all of the explanation involved. It seemed that once the meaning was understood, the lexical item itself became incidental.

The auditor was not always asked to provide the word, but would sometimes provide the word voluntarily when it was obvious, e.g.,

19) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 4)
Teresa: You know about the (.2) Kentucky- Kentucky?
Farokh: Fried chicken.
Teresa: Yes, I don't like that (.) part very much.

The negotiated aspects of word search become apparent in the conversation of Ming and Natasha. Not only did the speaker confer with the auditor, but in some cases the auditor initiated word searches of his own, "touched off" by the speaker's search. In this way, the word search became a totally interactive process, and led to mutual searches for many words. The extralinguistic features were also an important part of the interaction (to be discussed in Chapter 4).

20) (Natasha and Ming, p. 11)

Natasha: ...and Newton's laws, ya know three of Newton's laws and all the pressure and the balances
Ming: [points finger and waves looks away
the boy-yeah boys. mezz, uhhh what's that

Natasha: |N waves finger back and forth
|deductor it[an .hh]
Ming: [M looks|back at N.
[K? what|is that theee [uhh the systems:] - oh
Natasha: [the K it's a]
. .
Ming: constant,[moves finger, looks away and down
[constant, universal constants]
[nods...
Natasha: [const- it's a constant] yeah (.6) it's a
universal constant,|N puts finger up and M redirects gaze
|but it's called (.1) some different-
what's the name of it?|Puts hand on knee
|It's a long one.
Ming: It's a|hand motion
|bow- bow something (.1) man's constant, I think
that's what they call it.
Natasha: Yeah, but the name|N nods, M's eyebrows go into frown
|yeah I'm not sure about the name, but
|N and M nodding
it's a constant (1.) and it's pr- yeah it's a just constant
like the uhh (.8) R (.6) in the pressure and the center.

In this case both Natasha and Ming searched for words and alternated the complicated series of behavior to help each other build on each other's speech. In this way the negotiation involved is not only a means to achieve understanding for the auditor, but is also a tool for building a unit together. The speaker and auditor interchange so quickly that they almost merge into one. It is difficult to say if any of the words searched for were ever actually found, but their interaction was obviously a successful negotiation for meaning.

Other-Initiated Repair

Other-initiated repair refers to repair which is initiated by the other speaker rather than the one who uttered the trouble source. In this type of repair the auditor usually has a hearing or understanding problem and must initiate repair. Trouble spots occur quite

often in second language learners' conversations, as evidenced in the frequent self-repairs.

Usually the speaker of the trouble source will repair his own speech, when the other person initiates repair. This results in other-initiated self-repair, e.g.,

21) (Natasha and Ming, p. 5)
Natasha: Yeah, so I had to take the book from my hands and (.1) I went to bed about eleven (.6) so I was sitting all the time and looking the s-
Ming: .hh s'so
(.2)
Ming: y'mean you study up till (.4) you got home, all the way through till eleven?
Natasha: No I got home a:nd (.) I was <u>so</u> slee:py and then-

Placement:

The initiation of repair by the other person usually occupies the position of the turn right after the trouble source turn, e.g.,

22) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 5)
Farokh: You look nice today. Where did you buy your clithes?
Teresa: Where did I buyed it?
Farokh: Yes

Initiator Techniques:

The preceding example also points out one of the techniques used in other-initiated repair to initiate the repair process; repetition of the trouble source turn, although in this case slightly modified, resulting in an ungrammatical form. These initiator techniques are a group of turn constructional devices, such as: question words querying the entire proposition, e.g., "huh?," "hmm?", "what?":

23) (Hamid and Mari, p. 6)
Hamid: How did you spend there?
→Mari: Hmm?
Hamid: How long did you spend there?

Wh question words, e.g.,

"who," "where," "when"

24) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 14)
Farokh: ...man and woman are the s- you know are the same and they can (.) take a (permission)and (.) they ask for permission.
→Teresa: Where?
Farokh: in my country

a partial repeat of the trouble source turn plus a question word, e.g.,

25) (Hamid and Mari, p. 6)
Mari: Mm in Los Angeles too many- (.) mmm pray-rand
→Hamid: Too many what?
(.4)
Hamid: Playland, you mean.

a partial repeat of the trouble source turn, e.g.,

26) (Hamid and Mari, p. 6)
Hamid: How long did you spend there?
Mari: About (.) five (.) hour in- in spending (.4) spend at uh Magic Mountain
→Hamid: About five hours?
Mari: Yes.

and "you mean" plus a possible interpretation of the previous turn,

e.g.,

27) (Natasha and Ming, p. 3)
Natasha: I just was so mad (.2) and he didn't give us examples and he didn't have time to go on and review (.2) new, new part include in textbook a:n (.) we have to study at home by ourself
→Ming: [and (didn't work)] [you mean he last [last lecture?] [last time?]] just go over what's happening
Natasha: he didn't explain the new materials.

28) (Natasha and Ming, p. 4)
Natasha: Yeah I went to the parking lot
→Ming: Yesterday? ya[mean after school?]
Natasha: [yes I mean] after school (.8)

Operations During Repair:

Negotiation is a key factor in other-initiated repair, in that both the speaker and the other person must go through several interactive operations to locate the trouble source and to then repair it. Because the organization of conversation favors self-correction, so that the person who utters the trouble source should also be the one to correct it, there are additional burdens to the interaction.

Locating the trouble source is the first negotiated process. First language speakers occasionally make productive errors, which are usually self-corrected immediately. For second language learners there is an added dimension to sources of trouble in the area of syntactic errors which are not perceived as errors by the speaker and are not self-corrected immediately. Sometimes this leads to other more consequential negotiations, actually changing the direction of the interaction, pivoting around the repair sequence.

29) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 1)
Farokh: You are start or me?
Teresa: I'm what?
(.4)
Farokh: start
(.4)
Farokh: I- I- I'll start
Teresa: You can start

Farokh made a grammatical error, saying "you are start or me?" probably meaning "Will you start or shall I?". Teresa was confused, perhaps thinking that Farokh was using a formula like "you are & adjective," and asked "I'm what?". Her confusion was marked additionally by her posture and her expression. Farokh's initial attempt to repair was a partial repetition of his question: "start," in substitution for her question word. Unfortunately this did not correct the ungrammaticality of his original question, and did not clear up Teresa's confusion. When she did not react either verbally or extralinguistically, Farokh offered another repair, changing his question from an alternative to an answer of his own question, thereby eliminating the choice. He said "I- I- I'll start." Teresa finally understood and agreed with him. Due to Farokh's grammatical error, the interactional direction of their speech was changed drastically from an alternative, constructed so that pressure was somewhat heavier for Teresa to start, to a statement in which Farokh was forced to start and the burden of a new topic was put upon him.

Besides grammaticality, Mari and Hamid also had problems with lexical items, as witnessed in their word searches. Having once located the trouble source, making the repair on it was also a

negotiated process. This points out another difference with first language speakers; namely that the auditor may not understand what the speaker says. By repairing some confusion on Hamid's part, Mari took on the role of a teacher. This was, however, acceptable under the circumstances that Mari was correcting her own speech, after Hamid had initiated the repair and located the trouble source.

30) (Hamid and Mari, pp. 18-19)

Hamid: Do you- do you spend uh (.4) some drugs=
Mari: =mmhm=
Hamid: =in your food?
Mari: MM hm (.2) ye:s=
Hamid: =like saffron, or salt, or pepper [something] like that?
Mari: [m hmm]
Mari: Oh: I: see. Yes mm (1.0) Japanese?
Hamid: Yes, in [Japanese food]
Mari: [o:h] in Japanese food. Mmm Japanese food no:t spi-cy:
(.2)
Mari: almost-=
→Hamid: =what does it mean? spicy
Mari: Spicy means uh mm (1.0) mm mm m not- do you know spice?
(.2)
Mari: Spicy meaning uh sometimes with sed with uh tree seeds or uh: nuts
Hamid: Yes=
Mari: =mm example um tabasuko? and uh, muhstad [mm and pepper]
Hamid: [yes I got it]
Mari: not spicy Japanese food
(.2)
Mari: very soft taste
Hamid: Yeah
Mari: Yeah [mm]
Hamid: [It's] different from u:h Indian food.

When Hamid incorrectly used "drugs" to mean "spices," Mari understood him because he offered several examples of what he meant, "like saffron, or salt, or pepper or something like that." Mari very subtly corrected him, not overtly, but by substituting

the correct lexical item in her answer; "mm Japanese food not spicy." In making her repair Mari went through several techniques. She first tried to give a definition, but gave up; "spicy means uh mm." She then tried to approach the problem from a contrastive point of view; "not-." Perhaps she felt that the adjective suffix was a problem, so she asked about the noun; "do you know spice?" When this also proved unsuccessful, Mari gave a definition; "with sed with uh tree seeds or uh nuts." Hamid signalled that he now understood, but Mari continued to give examples; "mm example um tabasuko? (=tabasco) and uh, muhstad (=mustard)." At this point Hamid interrupted her, nodded and said "yes, I got it" while she went on with another example "and pepper." Accepting his understanding, Mari repeated her original turn, in which the repairable occurred; "not spicy Japanese food (.2) very soft taste." Hamid's comment then showed Mari that he really did understand; "It's different from uh Indian food."

In this repair sequence, Mari repaired her own speech by giving examples, definitions and by simplifying the word to its root in an attempt to help Hamid. He, in turn, signalled his understanding in several ways, including "yeah's," nodding, and then making an appropriate comment.

Other-initiated repair may also result in other-repair. Other-repair is a delicate matter, and usually only occurred after the other person gave the speaker numerous chances to repair his own speech. With the second language learners, however, there were

sometimes areas which they were incapable of correcting themselves. This was especially evident in the area of phonology for Mari. She had problems with intonation, in addition to speaking softly and sighing a lot, and was therefore difficult to understand. Hamid was usually very patient, but did not hesitate to correct Mari for pronunciation problems, e.g.,

31) (Hamid and Mari, p. 6)
Mari: Mm in Los Angeles too many- (.) mmm pray-rand
Hamid: Too many what?
(.4)
Hamid: Playland, you mean.
Mari: Prayland yes.

Other times, making the repair was a heavily negotiated process.

32) (Hamid and Mari, p. 13-14)

Mari: Ye:s, and uh umm very important to (.2) |looks away
mm waship (.2) religion and waship
(.4)
|shifts position in chair
Hamid: |'n what? [was]
Mari: [was] ip
(.4)
|eyebrows together
Hamid: |What's that?
|looks up |looks back, puts hand like praying
Mari: Wasip means |um (.6) mmm |the almost people wasip god (.2) uh wasip
(.8) H. moves eye-gaze away and up
Hamid: I don't understand (.4) wa- waship?
Mari: Waship. Y' yes mm [almost] |M. nods
Hamid: [you mean] I think you mean |worship
|claps hands, nods
Mari: |wars- yes
|H writes with finger on palm, M also writes on hand
Hamid: Worship. |W-O-R-S-S-I-P?? (.2) W-O-R-S-H-I-P
|nods
Mari: |S-H-I-P yes
Hamid: worship
[|nods]
Mari: waship [|yeah]
Hamid [yeah] like pray, like pray I [mean]
Mari: [mm hmm] (.6) yes mm

Mari seems to go through an abbreviated word search and comes up with the word "worship," pronouncing it /wasip/. Perhaps she realizes that this is not the target sound, and helps Hamid by providing another related word, so that he will understand the context: "religion and waship." This entire sequence is negotiated every step along the way and really demonstrates the teaching character of their speech with one another. Hamid must initiate repair and shows his discomfort and confusion by shifting in his chair. He asks, "What? was-". Mari anticipates his trouble and overlaps Hamid's isolation of the problem with another attempt at pronunciation, this time /wasip/. Hamid is totally confused and asks "What's that?" He must understand the target word before he can repair her problem, since she has been shown incapable of correcting it herself. In negotiating this sensitive matter of having someone else correct her, Mari tries to give a definition as well as the iconic gesture of praying with her hands together. Hamid still shows no recognition. After unsuccessfully repeating the word - according to the motto: "after all else fails, repeat the word over and over" - Hamid says "I think you mean worship." Mari nods and repeats the word, again incorrectly pronounced. Until now, Mari has taken the role of a teacher, explaining and providing examples for a student who does not understand. Now Hamid takes over the "interactional classroom" and spells the word out for her twice, writing on the palm of his hand. She also writes it on her hand and agrees. Hamid repeats it again and she mimics him, although she still pronounces it incorrectly. He is not sure that is what she

meant because Mari agrees with everything, so he provides yet another definition "like pray." Mari agrees and changes the subject, putting the burden on Hamid to say something. She never completes what she was going to say, but after all that drilling, she probably wanted Hamid to talk for awhile.

In the entire conversation between Natasha and Ming, negotiation played an important role in making repairs. In the following example, Natasha goes back and forth between answers, before she looks at Ming to see if she can help. Ming waited until invited to provide the repair, selecting one of the alternatives Natasha offered. The restrictions of repairing the other person's speech are so strong that she then even couched her repair by saying, "I think," allowing Natasha to accept or reject her choice of the alternatives.

33) (Natasha and Ming, p. 7)

Natasha: Yeah, it only one grade. It's really - it really-
really important like twenty
N's eyebrows frown M's finger goes up
percent of the grade or twenty-five percent
(.2)
N looks at M
Natasha: twenty percent=
→Ming: =twenty-five I think=
Natasha: =uh twenty-five yeah.

In sum, in the verbal repairs in the conversations between the second language learners there were all types of repair. These included self-initiated repair resulting in both self-repair and other-repair, and other-initiated repair followed by self-repair and other-repair. Different techniques were used to initiate the repairs, depending on whether they were self- or other-initiated

repairs. Varied operations occurred while making the repairs; one of the most interesting being word search because of the differences between L1 and L2 practices. Negotiation proved to be one of the most essential parts of the repair process in all of the interactions.

Chapter 4

EXTRALINGUISTIC FEATURES ACCOMPANYING REPAIR

Researchers such as Goodwin (undated mimeo), Duncan (1976), and Kendon (1972) have attempted to understand interaction through an analysis of extralinguistic features. These extralinguistic features in conversation, such as eye gaze, facial expression, head, arm and hand movement, and posture, have proved to be important parts of any interaction.

Goodwin (undated mimeo), who conducted research at the University of Pennsylvania on eye gaze, takes the view that:

> ...sentences in natural conversation emerge as the products of a process of interaction between speaker and hearer as they mutually construct the turn at talk. (p. 1.)

Goodwin showed how the negotiation of an appropriate mutual attentiveness between the speaker and auditor, through eye gaze, can result in changes, both in the syntactic structure of the utterances and in the length of the turn being constructed. It appears from Goodwin's research that extralinguistic means can even determine and change the syntax of turns.

There have been many studies on the relationship between gestures and speech. Most of the studies have been concerned with <u>how</u> body movement expresses aspects of what the speaker is saying or with how body movement expresses unconscious thoughts.

However, Kendon (1972) in particular has concerned himself more with the organization of speech and body movement timing. He has observed that each speech unit is distinguished by a rhythmic

pattern and corresponding body-part involvement, which he refers to as the "speech-accompanying" movement. To signal the intention to talk there is a change in position for one or more body parts which is called the "speech-preparatory" movement. Kendon also observed that the time between the speech preparatory movement and the onset of speech is related to the size of the speech unit; for instance, the timing would be earlier and more extensive for larger units. He has also observed that when the form of the movement is iconic, the movement begins before the lexical item it marks, but ends when the lexical item ends. While many festures are iconic, Kendon states that gestures seem to have more to do with attention-getting and forewarning recipients in order to assist in regulating turns, than in transmitting details of what is being said.

As yet few studies have focused on gestures which accompany any particular speech act or any particular function in conversation. Starkey Duncan Jr. (1976) did study the paralinguistic and kinesic behavior associated with turn-taking, using a complicated transcription method coordinating body motion and speech syllables.

Originally my thesis research was only meant to include the extralinguistic features as a way to enrich and differentiate the present descriptions of verbal repair, and as an invaluable tool for transcription. As it developed, however, the extralinguistic features were so important that they could not be separated from the verbal descriptions of repair. The negotiation between the speakers which took place during repair included both verbal and nonverbal

behavior working together. Slama-Cazacu (1976) refers to this as "mixed syntax," where visual means of communication serve both as a complement and a substitute for verbal communication.

In communication there are generally so many obstacles to understanding, especially for second language learners, that any resource which is available to the participants is invaluable for assistance. When such an important resource as nonverbal behavior is eliminated, second language learners must rely totally on their imperfect verbal resources. This might explain the problem of most second language learners in using a telephone in the second language, where one person cannot see what the other person is doing.

Intuitively it would seem that beginning learners rely heavily on gestures and verbal behavior to communicate. Everyone is familiar with the caricature of second language learners frantically miming elaborate gestures to communicate. Do second language learners indeed merely use "iconic gestures" (gestures which mime words), or do they also use gestures as part of the organization of interaction; that is, as signals for approaching speaker change, speech onset, etc.?

Another question often asked is whether the gestures differ according to language and cultural background. Due to the limited size of the data sample, present analysis does not include an examination of this question. However, there has been work done by researchers on the cultural differences of gestures. Walburga von Raffler Engel (1976) studied the culture-boundedness of kinesics

by looking at bilingual Canadian children during code-switching. She stressed the differences between "Anglophone" and "Francophone" gestures and found that the code-switching involved both language and kinesics, but that the two modalities were not treated in a parallel fashion.

In the previous chapter evidence was offered which indicated that there were differences in the form, initiation techniques and operations of repair, depending on whether the repair was self-initiated or other-initiated. Do the gestures which accompany self-initiated repair also differ from those used during repairs initiated by the other person? The answers to these questions provide important insights to the process of understanding through repair.

Extralinguistic Features Accompanying Self-Initiated Repair

Self-initiated repair was marked in some cases by both linguistic and extralinguistic means. This was especially noticeable with "uh" as an initiator technique. To mark self-initiated repair, the second language learners would often pause, say "uh," turn their eye gaze away from the speaker and look either up or down, frown with eyebrows pulled together and/or flutter their eyelids, e.g.,

1) (Hamid and Mari, p. 2)
Mari: My friend is a (.)mm (.) s'student now.
looks away, eyelids blink up and down
She go to uh Souther California (.2)
uh (1.) uh:

The broken eye gaze signalled a breakdown in the interaction, and seemed to serve both as a physical sign of emotional distress when the speaker was having trouble, and as a sign to the auditor

that repair would take place.[1]

In addition to changes in eye gaze during "uh's," hand movements also frequently changed, as noted in example 1. The speakers would usually suspend all other normal "speech-accompanying" gestures by stopping a hand gesture in midstream at the start of the self-repair, e.g.,

2) (Natasha and Ming, p. 3)
Natasha: home by ourself [and (didn't work)] [hands moving in rhythm
Ming: [you mean he] [just go over what's
happening [stops hand movement last (.)] [hands move again last lecture?]

Sometimes, however, turning away of the eye gaze would be accompanied by rotating the hand back and forth at the wrist until the repair was made. At the point of repair the speakers would return their gaze to the auditor and continue to gesture as before the pause, e.g.,

3) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 3)
Teresa: [eyegaze directed at Farokh... [looks up
y'know (.6) and dey was comin [uh (.6)
[hand rotating
about two minutes [(.6) each- each- uh
[returns eye gaze to F.
[between each one.

The beginning E.S.L. learner, Hamid, also often used hand gestures during the repair segments of his turn, which clearly show his frustration at having trouble slowing down what he had to say, e.g.,

4) (Hamid and Mari, p. 6)

Hamid: |gestures from left to right with arm
Uh|you could you

|in big circles from shoulder |continues first gesture
|uhhh see uhhh |all the places?

An exception to this pattern was found in the data of Natasha, the advanced learner. Frequently Natasha's self-repairs were made without pausing or saying "uh." She seemed so concerned with saying as much as she could as fast as she could, that she said the first word that came to mind, changed it and continued, many times not even completing a turn constructional unit before advancing to the next. She rarely marked her repair with extralinguistic features such as shifting her eye gaze or stopping a gesture in midstream. She continued her visual behavior as if everything were running smoothly linguistically, e.g.,

5) (Natasha and Ming, p. 5)

Natasha: |eye gaze directly at Ming, hands down scratching her leg
Yeah dictations always worries me and course I m-

|...
|mixed up myself (.2) I got back- I got slowed and
uh Joan was reading (.4) and I lost- you know (.6)
I lost my idear.

This sometimes seemed to confuse her auditor, perhaps because the repairs were not clearly marked extralinguistically. After Natasha said this, Ming had to initiate repair, e.g.,

6) (Natasha and Ming, p. 5)

Ming: |hand raised |fingers trilling in air |puts hand down
you|mean |about (.2)[two sentences?]
Natasha: [Y'yeah]'bout two
sentences

There did not appear to be any changes in the normal "speech-accompanying" gestures for the repair initiators, other than "uh" in all of the data samples.

During the operation of word search there were, on the other hand, an immense variety of extralinguistic features which accompanied the verbal repair work being done. Almost all of the word searches involved a complicated series of behavior. The complexity is well-illustrated by Mari. She and Hamid were talking about an amusement park, and she seemed to be searching for the word "ferris wheel."

7) (Hamid and Mari, p. 5)

Mari: ...for junior high school? or adults because
claps hands
that's uh many kind of
looks up and flutters eyelids, purses lips,
uhh (1.) mmmmm
closes eyes, grits teeth
(1.5)
opens hands, looks at H
example Jet Corso?
looks away, hands in lap
and uh mmmm
hands up,
Water Shoot?
looks back at H
very, very mmmm
closes eyes, fingers moving
(1.) ve:ry

Hamid: inter[esting]
Mari: [yeah] interesting and
fingers in circle motion
huh huh huh
iconic gestures
Jet Corso is uh
very fast.

Hamid: Yeah like merry-go-round

Mari: Not- not merry-go-round because (.2)
gestures over shoulder
we are- we are (.2) opposite.

She first clapped her hands together, and then said "uh," then she pursed her lips, while she looked up and fluttered her eyelids, then she said "um" again, closed her eyes and gritted her teeth. Then she even provided an example, marking it by the word

"example" while opening her hands wide and looking at the auditor and asking "Jet Corso?". All of this activity put the burden on the auditor to supply the word. When he did not provide the word, she tried even more strategies; she again looked away and said "uh," then she looked back at him and provided yet another example by asking "Water Shoot?". She tried to elaborate by saying "very very mmm" and closed her eyes while her fingers drummed the air. Finally her auditor responded and offered "interesting" as the word. Mari politely rejected this by saying "yeah interesting," but by giggling while she gestured with her hand in a circle to give him an iconic clue. The auditor again offered something, "Yeah like merry-go-round" which she again rejected by saying, "not-, not merry-go-round, we are opposite" and gestured over her shoulder. Then she either finally gave up or she decided that her auditor had understood without the word.

Iconic gestures were very predominant during word searches. This is perhaps explained by the fact that word searches are the search for a label, and there is a high level of frustration involved in looking for just the right word. In trying to find a word as quickly as possible, extralinguistic resources are invaluable.[2]

8) (Natasha and Ming, p. 12)

Natasha: ...foundation an and you know some metals and you- you study their (1.) .hh their- what (.2) how do you say? | hands opposite one another, y'know when they | pouring gestures react (.2) how they react to different substances.

Ming: I don't know.

Natasha used iconic gestures; in this case pouring gestures. She used both hands to show one substance opposite the other and

coming together. She went on to explain further, all the time gesturing back and forth to show the reaction she was referring to, but the word she was looking for was apparently never "found."

The extralinguistic features usually served to help the auditor join in the search to find the word for the speaker. The importance of these features is illustrated when the negotiation is not successful because there is no match-up between the verbal and visual behavior. The attempt to overtly confer with the auditor by asking "how do you say?" was shown in Chapter 3, example 18. This attempt is not always responded to unless accompanied by appropriate extralinguistic features, e.g.,

9) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 20)

```
Teresa: They have economics and (.2) th- the uh th' major
                                      |head turns away
        (.8) the uh uhh let's see (.8) |how do you call?
        (3.2)
        |eye gaze returns to F,
Teresa: |emphasis (.) in the development
        |nods
Farokh: |emphasis
```

In this case, when Teresa asked "how do you call?" she turned her head away from Farokh and moved her eyes up and down. She did not return her gaze to Farokh until she found the word "emphasis" after an extremely long pause. She found the word herself before she "gave up" and asked the auditor to help her. That is, she verbally asked Farokh to help her by saying " how do you call?" But the strength of eye-contact away from the auditor overrode her verbal negotiation. Unless the speaker also directs his eye gaze to the auditor, the verbal question remains just a type of thinking out loud.

Extralinguistic Features Accompanying Other-Initiated Repair

When the auditor wishes to initiate repair, he must somehow show that he is not going to proceed with the expected business. This is because repair draws attention away from the "normal" course of an interaction. To signal the intention to talk, speakers have available various "speech-preparatory" actions (Kendon, 1972). These include changes from a stationary position; there can be a posture shift, the hands start raising, the expression becomes animate and the lips part with an inbreath.

The repair sequence was often signalled by a change in posture and an expression of confusion along with the verbal repair, e.g.,

10) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 18)
Teresa: So um (.2) do I speak (.2) quite fast?
|head forward, eyebrows up
→Farokh: |You?
Teresa: Yeah

11) (Hamid and Mari, p. 6)
Hamid: How did you spend there?
|leans forward, questioning look, hand moves up
→Mari: |Hmm?
Hamid: How long did you spend there?
Mari: About (.) five (.) hours in- in spending (.4) spend at uh Magic Mountain.
Hamid: About five hours?
Mari: Yes [uh |hand from rt. to lft.,eyebrows together
→Hamid: [uh uh from |uh morning to: afternoon you mean?=
Mari: =yes.

Sometimes such "speech-preparatory" gestures on the part of the auditor were ignored by Natasha, who sped up what she was saying, although this increased rate of speed may have itself constituted an acknowledgement. Ming gave Natasha a chance to initiate repair and repair her own speech by not interrupting her, but by waiting until the end of another turn constructional unit, e.g.,

12) (Natasha and Ming, p. 5)

	M's hands open on lap...
Natasha:	Yeah, so I had to take the book from my hands
	M's lips open
	and (.) I went to bed about eleven (.6) so I was
	she moves hands into clasp
	sitting all the time and [looking the s-]
	M tilts head
Ming:	[.hh s'so] (.2)
	left. hand raised hand goes down stops
	y'mean you study up till (.4) you got home
	iconic gesture, sweep of hand from lft. to rt.
	all the way through till eleven?

There are, however, many occurrences of extralinguistic features, or a lack thereof, which substitute for speech in initiating repair. In the following case, Farokh's use of gestures initiates repair.

13) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 6)

Teresa:	Let's make some- um (1.2) we never have talked about our class, that's true.
→	(1.2) Farokh moves his head in a slight jerking motion, then tilts his head and leans his body forward, all the while gazing directly at Teresa.
Teresa:	We never have talked about our class?
	nods
Farokh:	ah, yeah

Teresa responded to Farokh's body posture and head tilt as if he had verbally initiated repair by asking "what?". Teresa then marked her repair with questioning intonation. When Farokh responded by nodding and saying "ah, yeah," Teresa continued. Extralinguistic features are also important in response to questioning intonation. Questioning intonation requires a response from the auditor, just as any question, showing that he understands and "normal business" can be resumed. In this way it can sometimes signal the end of a repair sequence. The response can be as simple as a nod, "uh hunh," "mm hmm," or "yeah," signalling agreement and understanding,

e.g.,

14) (Natasha and Ming, p. 11)
Natasha: It's completely different because that's (.)
like do you remember yesterday kinetic energy?
→ (.2) M. nods
Natasha: potential energy?=
=|nods
→Ming: |um hmm
Natasha: and Newton's laws.

On the other hand, a lack of extralinguistic reaction also initiated repair, e.g.,

15) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 1)
Farokh: You start or me?
|head forward, eyebrows raised
Teresa: |I'm what?
(.4)
Farokh: start
→ (.4) Teresa completely stationary, no expression change
|F gestures with hand, tapping out beats
Farokh: |I- I- I'll start
|smiles and nods
Teresa: |you can start

Teresa's total non-response to Farokh's repair initiated in itself another repair. Until Teresa signalled that she had understood, Farokh could not return to the sequence which was in progress before the repair was initiated. Since Teresa did not indicate that she understood, Farokh made another attempt at a repair, which was then accepted, indicated verbally and extralinguistically.

In sum, extralinguistic features are important in making repairs. The nonverbal behavior during self-initiated repair included a shift of gaze direction away from the auditor at the start of saying "uh," and sometimes hand rotation. During word searches, however, a wide assortment of extralinguistic behavior was evident. This consisted of eyelid fluttering, lip pressing,

hand rotation, posture changes and iconic gestures. For repair initiation by the other speaker, extralinguistic features were used both as attention-getting devices and as a means of showing confusion. This included leaning forward, eyebrow movement, finger pointing and lip parting. Visual behavior may also substitute for verbal behavior when the auditor initiates a repair, implementing such means as leaning forward, head tilting and frowning with the eyebrows. The lack of visual behavior may also initiate a repair, so that the speaker will continue to repair, until receiving some sign, verbal or nonverbal, of understanding.

Chapter 5

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE THREE CONVERSATIONS

The three conversations, although each only fifteen minutes long, differed significantly. Some of the more general differences were the differences between the personalities of the students and how they may have affected the discourse, and the differences in the students' fluency, which may have influenced their interest in their discourse partner and their engagement in the conversation. Some of the specific differences among the conversations were the different types of repair initiation and operations, which were evident in the data.

The general differences among the students were noticeable in their degree of fluency. A sample of two students from each level is obviously too small to make any claims about the use of repair according to proficiency levels, but there were differences in these students' abilities to use English, as evidenced in the type of repair they used. Their fluency and ability to use English to communicate may have been affected by factors other than proficiency. A factor which could have influenced the students' fluency may have been the degree of interest and engagement in the conversation the students felt, according to the type of friendship involved between each pair of students. Although each student pair was a "friendship pair," there were differences in the types of friendship the students had. The differences may have been partly due to the

way in which the students were selected.

When recruiting students for this study, I inquired of other teachers about "friends in your class who are from different language backgrounds." But we obviously had varying definitions of "friendship." My own definition included Natasha and Ming, from my own E.S.L. class, who spent time outside of class together, and who shared many interests. On the other hand, the teacher whose students were Hamid and Mari, replied to my request, "All of my students are friends." Obviously even when I wanted "the closest friends in the class," there was a great difference in our definitions of friendship. Hamid and Mari occasionally spoke to each other during their class breaks, but they shared few interests and would be best classified in my terms as "acquaintances." Teresa and Farokh themselves responded to my request for friends. They were interested in each other, based on a kind of teasing and flirting relationship. Many of the Spanish-speaking females in the class, including Teresa, teased Farokh about being a Persian who had a harem in Iran.

Needless to say, no two friendships are the same and they are difficult to measure on any scale. But it was not hard to tell which of the pairs knew each other well, and which did not. Those of the students who felt totally relaxed and uninhibited as well as interested in the company of their friend may have been able to express themselves more fluently than those who were not completely comfortable.

Differences in proficiency were also evident in the repairs

which were made, specifically in the kind of negotiation and building together of speech between the students during repairs.

Ming and Natasha

Ming and Natasha, the advanced learners, had many things to talk about which were of shared interest. In addition to being together in their E.S.L. class, they were together in introductory mathematics and chemistry classes. Thus, they had many of the same concerns and seemed to know each other well.

Both Natasha and Ming used self-repair most of the time. Their self-repairs included not only hesitations while looking for a word, but also substitutions for refinement of the concept, e.g.,

1) (Natasha and Ming, p. 4)
Natasha: I always have a pro- some kind of problems after school.

2) (Natasha and Ming, p. 4)
Ming: But the test will be on that, too. I mean (.) today's quiz.

In both of these examples, it does not seem that the projected original proposition would present any problems of understanding; "I always have a problem after school" or "but the test will be on that, too." But Natasha and Ming were able to avoid any confusion which might have led to other-initiated repair by anticipating the needs of the auditor. In example 2, Natasha may have thought Ming was referring to a big test such as the midterm, rather than the small quiz that day. This could have led to more expansions, in order to achieve understanding.

Negotiation took place in their word searches and also in other-initiated repair. In the word searches, such as those in

Chapter 3, example 20, Ming and Natasha relied on each other to find the respective words. They built on each other's speech to come to the solution together. In this case, the solution was difficult to locate, as the word being searched for was never found; rather the solution was the understanding which occurred from the process of repair. The advanced learners negotiated this search so well that they even completed each other's sentences, e.g.,

3) (Natasha and Ming, p. 11)
Natasha: The K it's a
→Ming: oh, constant, [constant, universal constants]
→Natasha: [const- it's a constant]

4) (Natasha and Ming, p. 15)
Ming: So, but you need something like hundred n' twenty
(.4)
→Natasha: [to get a (.) a bachelors yeah]
Ming: [to get a degree before you-] yeah a bachelors.

In this way, Natasha and Ming interchanged so quickly that their roles as speaker and auditor merged. This speed of interchange was another characteristic of their proficiency which was different from the other conversations. By working together, Natasha and Ming used negotiation not only as an aid for understanding for the auditor, but also as a means for building a unit. The ability to build on each other's speech to achieve a unit which fit together was directly related to the negotiation involved in the repair sequences, as well as to the flow of topics. It was in this ability that the greatest difference between Natasha and Ming's conversation and the others' conversations was observed.

In other-initiated repair, Natasha and Ming rarely questioned the entire proposition by saying "huh?" or "what?". Usually,

other-repair was initiated by "you mean" and a possible interpretation of the trouble source turn, e.g.,

5) (Natasha and Ming, p. 3)

Natasha: I just was so mad (.2) and he didn't give us examples and he didn't have time to go on and review (.2) new, new part include in textbook a:n (.) we have to study at home by ourself [and (didn't work)]

→Ming: [you mean he] just go over what's happening last [last lecture?]

Natasha: [last time?] he didn't explain the <u>new</u> materials.

6) (Natasha and Ming, p. 4)

Natasha: Yeah I went to the parking lot

→Ming: <u>Yesterday</u>? ya [mean after school?]

Natasha: [yes I mean <u>after</u> school (.6)

7) (Natasha and Ming, p. 5)

Natasha: Yeah, so I had to take the book from my hands and (.1) I went to bed about eleven (.6) so I was sitting all the time and looking the s-

Ming: .hh s'so (.2)

→Ming: y'mean you study up till (.4) you got home, all the way through till eleven?

By offering an interpretation of the preceding turn, the other person also offered a candidate solution, which could be accepted or rejected by the person who made the turn. In this way, the other person demonstrated his understanding of what was said. The speaker could then build on the auditor's understanding to make his repair, rather than having to construct it entirely by himself. The other conversations did not include this kind of repair initiation; that is, "you mean" plus an interpretation of the previous turn.

Ming and Natasha indeed stood out among the others as being more advanced. Their interaction was always quick and not characterized by long pauses. There were also no gaps between topics; one

topic "led" into the next. Their self-repairs were not just hesitations and cut-offs, but included refinements of what they had said, to provide more precise information. The word searches and other-initiated repair were negotiated processes, which provided numerous opportunities for building from each other's speech to construct a unit.

Teresa and Farokh

The intermediate learners, Teresa and Farokh, were acquainted through their E.S.L. class, which met every afternoon for two hours. They also occasionally met before the class for coffee and during the breaks. Most of their topics concerned their class together and social activities, such as parties and holidays. Teresa and Farokh were not as similar to each other as Ming and Natasha were. Teresa was by far the livelier and more animated person, as evidenced by the frequent gestures she used. She laughed a lot and was usually the one to nominate a new topic. On the other hand, Farokh was very stiff and serious; he actually sat on his hands for most of the conversation. A large part of his unnaturalness was probably due to the presence of the camera, although he is normally also a quiet and serious person, according to his classmates.

Teresa and Farokh's self-repair consisted mainly of pauses, cut-offs, and word repetitions, e.g.,

8) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 13)
Teresa: because you know (.2) we- we have to- to start and they came or uh (.) to repeat, she has to repeat.

9) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 14)
Farokh: Now (.2) you know, now man and w- w- w- man and woman are the s- (.) ya know are the same and they can (.) take a (permission) and (.) they ask for permission.

There were only two word searches in fifteen minutes of conversation, e.g.,

10) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 4)
Teresa: You know about the (.2) Kentucky- Kentucky?
Farokh: Fried Chicken
Teresa: Yes I don't like that part very much.

Farokh didn't wait for Teresa to ask him for help, but provided the word voluntarily. The process lasted only two turns long. Because Farokh could supply the word, a lengthy negotiation process was not necessary.

The other word search was also very simple and did not consist of a complicated series of verbal and non-verbal behavior, characteristic of the word searches in the other two conversations.

11) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 20)
Teresa: They have economics and (.2) th- the uh th' major
head turns away
(.8) the uh uhh let's see (.8) how do you call?
(3.2)
Teresa: | eye gaze returns to F.
emphasis (.) in the development
Farokh: | nods
emphasis

Teresa did not allow Farokh to help her, in that she did not direct her gaze to him. Such an absence of negotiation was characteristic of much of their conversation.

Teresa and Farokh never used "you mean" plus an interpretation of the prior turn to indicate other-repair. Partial repetitions

and repetitions with a question word were employed most often, e.g.,

12) (Teresa and Farokh, p. 5)
Farokh: You look nice today. Where did you buy your clithes?
Teresa: Where did I buyed it?
Farokh: Yes

13) (Teresa and Farokh, p.1)
Farokh: You are start or me?
Teresa: I'm what?
Farokh: start.

There were not many other-initiated repairs that took place in Teresa and Farokh's conversation. Most of the repair work occurred in self-initiated self-repair. Teresa and Farokh had a very slow-paced conversation, with long pauses betweeen topics. The topics did not lead into one another as Natasha and Ming's topics did. There was a vast difference in fluency from Natasha and Ming's conversation.

Hamid and Mari

The beginning learners, Hamid and Mari, did not seem to have much in common. They were acquainted through their E.S.L. class, which practiced a lot of group work. Apparently they also conversed occasionally during the breaks. Hamid was similar to Farokh, in that he was very serious and not relaxed. Instead of sitting on his hands like Farokh, Hamid was constantly "grooming"; he fingered his hair and stroked his mustache during the entire conversation. Mari acted more lively. She often used her hands to gesture and used distinctive facial expressions.

Although Hamid and Mari were from the same E.S.L. class, Mari was not as verbally proficient as Hamid. She stuttered quite a lot and repaired her own speech constantly.

Both Mari and Hamid marked their self-repairs with cut-offs, pauses, repeated words, and "uh", e.g.,

14) (Hamid and Mari, p. 23)
Mari: But in uh Japan about hundred years ago (.2) mm we don't eat uh meats in- in- because four legs animals don't eat (.4) Japanese people.

15) (Hamid and Mari, p. 9)
Hamid: but in the (.2) mm normal li- night
[in the] in the in the week=
Mari: [mm hmmm]
Mari: =mm hmm
Hamid: I think it- it is not uhh crowded like that- like that.

16) (Hamid and Mari, p. 12)
Mari: And uh Japanese dancing is- uh dancing has (.2) has a story (.3) many different story.

Mari had problems with pronunciation, so some of her self-repairs involved practicing a word until she could say it, e.g.,

17) (Hamid and Mari, p. 3)
Mari: She she learn learning uh architeksh (.) architectua:l.

Some of Hamid's self-initiated repairs involved a correction of a grammatical/lexical item, e.g.,

18) (Hamid and Mari, p. 9)
Hamid: Y'yes but I- I couldn't dance on- on <u>in</u> there because it was very crowded.

19) (Hamid and Mari, p. 8)
Hamid: We say uh: when you (.2) <u>if</u> you'd drop- if you drop a needle.

The word search described in Chapter 4, example 7, about the search for "ferris wheel," distinctly points out how much cooperation and negotiation occurred in this process for understanding. However, in another word search, Hamid found the word he was looking for by himself, e.g.,

20) (Hamid and Mari, p. 7)
Hamid: I went to a: (.) discotheque not exactly discotheque
Mari: [mm hmm
Hamid: [it [H.'s hand to mouth
[was a:]
(.8) fingers drum the air
Hamid: [hands go out
[uh pub.

Mari did not have time to help Hamid, and perhaps she did not even realize that there was a word search taking place, since her agreement "mm hmm" overlapped Hamid's initiation.

Of all the other-initiated repairs in their conversation, Mari only made one. It was initiated by a question word which questioned the entire proposition, e.g.,

21) (Hamid and Mari, p. 6)
Hamid: How did you spend there?
Mari: Hmm?
Hamid: How long did you spend there?

It is hard to tell if Mari had difficulty with any particular part of the question, whether she did not understand the entire question, or if she just did not hear the question.

The rest of the other-initiated repairs in their conversation were directed from Hamid to Mari. Often Hamid seemed to understand Mari, but used repair to correct her pronunciation, e.g.,

22) (Hamid and Mari, p. 6)
Mari: Mm in Los Angeles too many- (.) mmm pray-rand
Hamid: Too many what?
(.4)
Hamid: Playland, you mean.

The process became a little more involved with the word "worship" (described in Chapter 3, example 31), to which Hamid devoted more time. Although this interaction was negotiated, the topic that had been

referred to before the repair sequence was dropped. After the correction the topic was changed. Although a negotiation for understanding occurred, Hamid and Mari did not build on each other's speech to make a unit by completing each other's sentences and continuing the topic.

Mari was also able to assume the teaching role when Hamid asked what "spicy" meant (refer to Chapter 3, example 30). Again the repair seemed to have then terminated the topic.

Hamid and Mari negotiated for understanding in both word searches and other-initiated repair. However, they did not build on each other's speech to construct a unit, as Natasha and Ming did. Natasha and Ming showed attentiveness by completing each other's sentences and by both contributing to the topic, regardless of who had started it. To the contrary, although Mari constantly gave agreement, she did not actually seem engaged in the conversation, since she just posed interview-type questions to Hamid about his topics.

Mari seemed very concerned with agreement throughout the conversation. Her overuse of "yes," "mm hmm," and "oh I see" was in fact disconcerting many times, because it did not always seem evident that she understood, and since she did not add anything, it put the burden on Hamid to continue, e.g.,

23) (Hamid and Mari, pp. 14-16)

Hamid: Um we have uh many traditional
(.2)
Mari: mm hmm
Hamid: many traditional (.) custom, like your country.
Mari: mm hmm
(.4)
Hamid: But uh: a:ll (.4) for all of the old traditional customs is mixed (.2) with uh: (.4) Islamic- traditions and uh:=
Mari: =mm hmm
(2.0)
Hamid: and uh before that, be- before Is- slam=
Mari: =Islam? [yes]
Hamid: [be] cause before Islam the religion of the people of my country (.) was uh was Zal- Zaudushki
Mari: Salgushki? [yes]
Hamid: [yes,] Zaudush is a (.) name of a prophet.
Mari: mm hmm
(.6)
Hamid: uh: (.4) he was uh many many long ago.
Mari: mm hmm
(.2)
Hamid: uh we have uh we have many traditional custom from uh this religion and [this]culture.
Mari: [mm hmm]
Mari: mm hmm
Hamid: and: many religion from the Islamic culture.
Mari: mm hmm
Hamid: A:nd now: uh some of them is mixed
Mari: mm hmm
Hamid: together.
Mari: mm hmm
(1.0)
Hamid: a:nd uh uh: but uh we have many customs.like uh, like dancing
(.2)
Hamid: or like uh (.2) in a (.) music? [You know music?]
Mari: [mm hmm]

...

For pages of transcript Mari's only response was "mm hmm" or repetitions of the last word of Hamid's preceding turn. It is not clear whether Mari was interested in what Hamid was saying or if she understood.

In sum, the three conversations were very different. The conversation between Natasha and Ming could be characterized as being very fast-paced, with easy transitions into topics, topics "touched off" by preceding topics and mutual sentence completions. Repairs included "you mean" plus interpretations of the prior turn, and complex word searches. This conversation involved two close friends with many shared experiences and interests. Both of the students were very proficient in communicating, and had also placed into an advanced E.S.L. level.

Teresa and Farokh's conversation was much "slower" in comparison. There were gaps between topics and the topics did not always relate to the preceding topic. Fewer word searches and other-initiated repairs were done than in the other two conversations. Teresa and Farokh had few shared interests and Teresa seemed much more outgoing than Farokh. They were obviously less proficient in negotiation and less competent in English than Natasha and Ming.

Mari and Hamid's conversation was also "slow." They did not build on each other's speech, and at times seemed barely interested in what the other person was saying. Much repair work took place in their conversation, but it was different from the other conversations, because it involved correction in areas where one of the speakers was incompetent. There was also a bigger difference in English proficiency between the two students than between the other participants.

These observations apply solely to the conversations between these students, but they indicate that further research is necessary

to examine the differences, not just in competence in linguistic structures, but also in competence in discourse, for speakers who have been placed in various E.S.L. proficiency levels.[2]

Chapter 6

COMPARISON OF THE L1 AND L2 DATA

Repair in conversations between native speakers of English has been described by Jefferson (1972, 1974), Sacks and Schegloff (1974), and Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977). These descriptions include a discussion of initiator techniques, placement, and trajectories of repair, and also the organization for the favored use of self-repair over other-repair. At present Gaskill (1977) is conducting research on repair in conversations between a second language learner and several different native-speakers of English. Jordan and Fuller (1975) have described some features of repair in conversations between non-native speakers of Spanish, but, to my knowledge, there have been no studies on repair in conversations between second language learners of English.

In "The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation," Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) describe the organizational preference for self-repair. "Preference" is a technical term used by conversational analysts to refer to the sequence and turn organizational features which favor the use of one feature over another, not to refer to the speaker's motivation. Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) report that there may be an exception to the constrained appearance of other-correction:

> The exception is most apparent in the domain of adult-child interaction, in particular parent-child interaction, but may well be more generally relevant to the not-yet-competent in some domain without respect to age. (p. 33)

In examining repairs in conversations between second language learners, I attempted to see if adult second language learners might fall into the category "not-yet-competent in some domain without respect to age," by comparing Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks' description of the L1 data with my L2 data.

L1 Description

To date, the most complete description of the organizational preference for self-correction in repair lies in "The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation," by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977).[1]

The authors based their analysis on a large body of audio- and videotaped materials of naturally-occurring conversations in English, and transcriptions of these materials. Over a period of many years the researchers have begun to describe phenomena in conversational interactions which are intrinsically organized. One of these phenomena is the system of repair.

In their paper (1977), the authors discuss evidence that self-correction and other-correction are related in organization, but that they are not to be considered as alternatives or as equivalent features. Rather self-correction is preferred to other-correction.

The authors found some initial tentative support of both the distinction between self- and other-correction and of their preferential relationship in casual examination of conversation, in which self-correction is more common than other-correction. They then explored the organization of repair case-by-case to understand

this "skewed" distribution.

The authors looked at distinctions between self-initiated and other-initiated repair. They discussed the differences in the initiation of repair by self or "other," in terms of the placement, the initiator techniques, and the courses or trajectories from initiation to repair.

The self-initiation and other-initiation of repair were seen to be distinct but related to each other. They both handle the same types of trouble which occur in conversation; such as word replacement (discussed in Chapter 3, example 15), repairs on person references, e.g.,

1) (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, p. 15)

L: ...and uhn I don't know where we're going, I really
→ don't think there's much more they- y' know anybody
here c'n do for me.

and repairs of next-speaker selection (more than two participants), e.g.,

2) (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, p.17)

Dot: Yer getting s- look how // thin he's gettin.

The relationship between self- and other-initiation of rep[illegible] further seen in the order of their placement. Although a turn with a trouble source is often interrupted by the speaker of that turn ("self-initiated repair"), it is rarely interrupted by another person. Rather the other person will withhold his repair initiation until the completion of the speaker's turn. Not only that, but the other person frequently withholds his repair well into the transition space

of a turn, as evidenced by the frequent gaps before other-initiated repairs, e.g.,

3) (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, p. 15)

A: Hey the first time they stopped me from selling cigarettes was this morning.
(1.0)
B: From sellin cigarettes?
A: From buying cigarettes They // said uh
C: Uh huh.

This provides ample opportunity for the speaker of a trouble source to self-repair, e.g.,

4) (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, p. 25)

A: That sto:re has terra cotta floors.
(pause)
A: Not terra cotta. Terrazzo.

In returning to the original distinction between self- and other-correction, Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks noted how the prevalence of self- over other-correction was produced, namely:

> (i) opportunities for self-initiation come before opportunities for other-initiation
> (ii) massively, for these repairables which do have repair initiated on them, same-turn and transition-space opportunities for self-initiation are taken by speakers of the trouble source;
> (iii) the course or trajectory of same-turn initiated repairs regularly leads to successful self-repair in same turn, i.e., before the position for other-initiation. (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977, p. 24)

In addition, the authors found in their data that other-initiations usually resulted in self-corrections. This may be accounted for by the way techniques for other-initiation are structured to locate the trouble source, but not to offer the candidate repair in the same turn. This provides the speaker of the

trouble source with another opportunity to repair in the next turn, even if the other person could have made the repair himself, e.g.,

5) (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, p. 27)

Ken: 'E likes that waider over there
Al: Wait-er?
Ken: Waitress, sorry
Al: 'At's bedder.

Although self-initiated self-correction is most prevalent and organizationally preferred, the researchers also offered some observations about the few other-corrections which do occur. The other-corrections which are done are often modulated in form, either by use of a question format, uncertainty markers or by transformation into a joke. These modulated other-corrections are sometimes understanding checks. Other-corrections which are not modulated in form usually occur after understanding checks.

The authors also made another observation about other- repair. They pointed out that other-initiated repair seeks to clear up problems of understanding so that the speaker can continue with the sequentially-implicated next turn. If the other person understands a turn well enough to make a correction, then he hears or understands it well enough to have produced the sequentially-implicated next turn. It is for this reason that the "other" modulates his correction with uncertainty. This is also why other-correction is treated as not just a correction, but frequently as disagreement on the other person's part.

Finally, Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks noted that there may be an exception to the highly constrained use of other-correction.

This exception is most apparent in conversations of parents and their children, but may also be generally true for the "not-yet-competent" in any domain. In this way, other-correction can be seen as a vehicle for language socialization in helping learners to become adequate self-correctors and self-monitors.

L2 Description

A comparison of my data on repair for second language learners and the observations made by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks about repair for native speakers of English reveals great similarities in the placement of the repair initiation, the initiator techniques, and the preference for self-correction. The other-corrections which were made in the L2 data were not similar to the description of L1 examples, but they supported the observation that other-correction may be a vehicle for language socialization.

Placement:

The placement of the repair initiations for the second language learners were the same as for native speakers. Self-initiated repair occurred in the same turn as the trouble source (Chapter 3, example 2), and in the transition space of the turn (Chapter 3, example 4). I could not find any examples of self-initiated repair occurring in the third turn to the trouble source, that is in the turn after the turn which follows the trouble source turn, e.g.,

6) (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, p. 9)

Hannah: And he's going to make his own paintings.
Bea: Mm hm
Hanna: And- or I mean his own frames

Bea: Yeah

Although there was an absence of this kind of placement, it does not necessarily follow that second language learners do not use this placement sometimes.

Other-initiations of repair matched the L1 description; other-initiated repair occurred in the turn after the trouble source turn.

Initiator Techniques:

The initiator techniques for both first and second language speakers were also the same (refer to Chapter 3, examples 7,8,9,10, 11,12,13,14,23,24,25 and 26), with one qualification. This qualification concerns the use of "you mean" plus an interpretation of the trouble source turn (Chapter 3, examples 27 and 28). This "formula" was only employed as a repair initiator by Natasha and Ming, the advanced learners, and not by the other learners. As was discussed earlier, this type of initiator technique involves at least some type of understanding on the part of the auditor. In this way the auditor can help the speaker make a repair of his own speech, by proffering something upon which the speaker can build. It may be that this is an initiator technique too demanding for beginning learners.

Operations During Repair:

It was during the repair operations that many of the differences between the L1 and L2 data showed up. The operation of word search was perhaps the most striking. Several of the word searches (Chapter 3, example 20, and Chapter 4, example 7) involved

extremely long series of verbal and extralinguistic behavior. In these word searches the word itself was usually not a person's name, as for native speakers (Chapter 3, example 17), but involved all types of lexical items ("ferris wheel," "the constant," "emphasis," etc.). The length of the operations during other-initiated repair was also sometimes very different from the L1 data, because of the types of trouble sources involved. These included problems with phonology (Chapter 3, examples 31 and 32), with grammar (Chapter 3, example 29), and lexical items (Chapter 3, example 30).

The Preference for Self-Correction:

The L2 data fully supported the observations about the L1 data, that self-repair was preferred to other-repair. This was evident in the withholding of other-initiation until the completion of a turn, providing the person who spoke the trouble source full opportunity to repair it himself. Not only this, there was usually a gap before the other person initiated repair, showing that it had been withheld even into the transition space. Sometimes the gap was extremely long and the other person only initiated repair extralinguistically (Chapter 4, example 13).

In one case Ming even withheld her repair initiation through another turn-constructional unit, e.g.,

7) (Natasha and Ming, p. 5)

Natasha: Yeah, so I had to take the book from my hands and (.) I went to bed about eleven (.6) so I was sitting all the time and

→Ming: [looking the s-
[.hh s'so] (.2) y'mean you study up till (.4) you got home all the way through till eleven?

In such ways, most of the other-initiated repairs resulted in self-repair for the second language learners, just as was true for the native speaker data (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, 1977).

Other-Corrections:

Other-correction was limited in the data, except for the beginning learners, Hamid and Mari. The advanced learners used one of the types of modulation described for native speakers; uncertainty markers, e.g.,

8) (Natasha and Ming, p. 7)

```
Natasha:  Yeah, it only grade.  It's really- it really-
                                                |N's eyebrows frown
          really important like twenty          |percent of
                                                |M's finger goes up
          the grade or twenty-five              |percent
          (.2)
          |N looks at M
Natasha:  |twenty percent=
→Ming:    =Twenty-five, I think=
Natasha:  =uh twenty-five yeah.
```

Ming said "I think" to Natasha's question of alternatives, which allowed Natasha to accept or reject her choice. This example also shows how Ming sought to avoid making her choice of alternatives look like a disagreement with Natasha. She waited to give her choice until she was looked at by Natasha to invite Ming to respond and added the modulated form "I think."

The beginning learners supported the exception to other-repair discussed by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977). They seemed to fall under the category of "not-yet-competent," where other-correction was a means of language socialization. Their problems were of a kind which involved an incompetency in an area of language which

a native speaker would be able to correct himself. Native speakers occasionally make production errors, but are theoretically capable of correcting themselves. The other-corrections of the second language learners were, however, in areas of language, such as phonology, syntax, and lexicon, which the students were not capable of correcting themselves (refer to Chapter 3, examples 31,32, and 30).

In conclusion, the data on repairs made by second language learners generally support the observations on repair made by first language speakers (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977). The repairs which were made were similar in the placement of their initiation and initiator techniques. However, the length of operations during repair differed from those of native speakers, especially during word search and problems involving phonology. After examining how the non-native speakers withheld the initiation of repair on the other's speech into the transition space, how most other-initiated repair resulted in self-repair, and how much more prevalent self-repair was than other-repair, it was obvious that self-correction is preferred to other-correction also in the speech of these second language learners. They frequently negotiated with each other and repeatedly gave the other person chances to correct his own speech.

When the trouble source involved was a matter of incompetence in phology, syntax, or lexicon, one speaker would correct the other. This would support the observation made by Schegloff,

Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) that other-correction appears to be a vehicle of language socialization for those who are still learning to be adequate self-correctors.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

Statement of Findings

Following are the most important findings from my research on repair in conversations between adult second language learners of English.

Linguistic Findings:

1) The repair which was used by the adult second language learners was very similar in form, operation and function to repair used by adult native speakers of English (described by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, 1977).

2) As for native speakers of English, self-initiated self-repair was preferred to other-repair for the second language learners, evident in how other-initiated repair was withheld into the transition space, in how most other-initiated repair resulted in self-repair, and in how much more prevalent self-repair was than other-repair.

3) However, unlike adult native speakers of English, the adult second language learners' other-repairs reflected incompetence in phonology, syntax and lexicon. These types of other-repairs occurred most frequently in the conversation of the beginning students, and they would support the observation of Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) that other-correction might serve as a vehicle of language socialization for those who are still learning to be adequate self-monitors.

4) The advanced students did sometimes modulate their

other-correction with uncertainty markers, similar to native speaker other-correction.

Extralinguistic Findings:

1) Extralinguistic features marked the distress and frustration of the speakers during self-initiated repairs, especially during word searches.

2) Extralinguistic features showed confusion and signalled speech onset during other-initiated repairs. Extralinguistic features sometimes substituted for other-initiated repair, and the lack of nonverbal behavior when it was necessary also initiated repair.

3) Iconic gestures were also important, especially during word searches, in negotiating understanding.

Other Findings:

1) There were differences between the learners' conversations corresponding to their proficiency level in E.S.L. The differences consisted mainly in the degree of interest and engagement of the students in each other; the fluency of the learners, as reflected in the speed of the interaction and the collaborative completion of sentences; the types of repair initiators used; and the length of the repair operations. The advanced learners tended to be more engaged in the conversation (which may be coincidentally related to their proficiency level), to have fast-paced conversations with many collaborative completions, and to have shorter repair operations than the beginning students.

Discussion

The results of the research also bring up other points regarding conversations between second language learners, in terms of the input to the learner, the form and function of speech concerning "errors," the engagement and interest of the participants, and the process of understanding.

Input to second language learners from other learners is not solely a concern of researchers, but also a concern of the learners themselves. In E.S.L. classrooms there has been a changing focus towards communicative competence, contextualized learning, and group work. However, many E.S.L. students resent group work and do not feel that it is useful, because they feel that they cannot learn from other second language learners. The data from the E.S.L. students in this study indicate that the students could deal with trouble which arose in the conversations and might have learned from each other. This was especially evident in word search and phonology problems, where for instance Hamid learned what "spicy" meant. Less overtly, but just as important, learning of conversational processes in communication seemed to take place during the process of negotiation which often occurred.

One concern in the input from one learner to another was the relationship between the form and function of speech. In these conversations, there were many occurrences of a breakdown of form or of function, resulting in "errors." The purpose of this research was to describe how adult second language learners deal with

trouble and errors in naturally-occurring conversations. But repair also occurs in the classroom. In classroom interactions repair is usually called correction. Many teachers are trying to let students correct themselves by initiating repair with such techniques as asking the student to repeat, repeating what the student said with questioning intonation, responding with silence, etc. Peer-correction is also being increasingly employed as a means of dealing with errors in the classroom, although to a large extent, this correction is for written rather than oral language.

In many ways, however, correction in the classroom has not "learned a lesson" from naturally-occurring conversation, in which repair is a negotiated process for understanding. In the classroom, learners' errors are usually corrected or at least called attention to, even though there is no impairment to hearing or understanding. This calling attention to errors may often cause anxiety in the learner to produce the correct form, denying him an opportunity to communicate and to make himself understood. Not only this, but correction in the classroom is often not negotiated between the learner who makes the "error" and those who are trying to understand him, the other learners. Rather, the teacher many times takes over the role of an additional outside negotiator or mediator, asking, "Does everybody understand Farokh?" or "Please explain to the class what you mean, Teresa." In this way the teacher either tells others to initiate repair, or artificially initiates repairs for the other learners. This artificiality and withholding of chances for

negotiation denies the learners valuable opportunities to actually communicate. If an E.S.L. teacher is truly interested in a communicative classroom, it might be interesting to see the results if only errors which led to misunderstanding were dealt with, and were dealt with in a manner which did not overemphasize them but would allow for negotiation. To this end, teachers might incorporate as many situations as possible in the syllabus which encourage negotiation, such as problem-solving, values-clarification, and possibly role-playing. The teacher could also provide a good model for "repair-specific vocabulary" to learn such phrases as "you mean..." or "what?" if the students needed help. Especially the formulas which only the advanced students used, "you mean" plus an interpretation, could be introduced earlier in contextualized materials. Also relevant to dealing with errors in the classroom is the use of a decentralized classroom, to emphasize the role of the learner as a teacher, which was often evident in my data on naturally-occurring conversations.

The atmosphere and goals of the classroom influence not only how errors are dealt with, but also the engagement and interests of the students in each other. In the naturally-occurring conversations, the fluency of the students seemed to be related to their interest in each other, as well as to their proficiency level. When totally engaged in the interaction, Natasha and Ming interchanged extremely quickly and even completed each other's sentences. Their close friendship seemed to provide both motivation and shared experiences to encourage such fluency. Not every E.S.L. classroom can provide

close friendships, but if the atmosphere of the class enhances motivation and the goals and tasks of the class furnish shared experiences, it would seem that at least these factors might further improve fluency.

The findings from the data also indicate the close relationship between understanding, negotiation, and repair in the attainment of successful interaction. When faced with a problem of understanding, the second language learners in this research negotiated their repair work. The learners employed varied linguistic and extralinguistic strategies to help each other repair, such as repetitions, pauses, definitions, examples, contrasts, averted eyegaze and hand movement signalling distress, facial and posture changes getting attention for speech onset, and iconic gestures acting out words. In various combinations, these techniques helped the learners attain understanding through repair.

Directions for Future Research

First, I hope that further research is conducted in the form of longitudinal studies of discourse. Such studies could include a study of two second language learner friends conversing together over time. Such a study might be able to look at the learners' acquisition of discourse skills, including repair initiator techniques and operations. Another type of longitudinal study might look at one learner's conversations with various other learners over time, ranging from strangers to intimates, to see the differences in engagement and fluency for the learner, depending on his interlocutor.

Second, since the most obvious differences with native-speakers were evident in the conversation of the beginners, a cross-sectional study of short conversations between truly beginning students might be interesting in order to examine how learners with minimal resources deal with a maximum number of problems.

Third, a study seems warranted of conversations between child second language learners and how they deal with errors and trouble. This might show some interesting differences from adult learners, and may have some bearing on the question of whether the acquisition of discourse rules for turn-taking and repair only need to be learned once, in the acquisition of the first language.

Fourth, research would be interesting on the repairs which are done in conversations of bilinguals, where mixing and switching occur. What kind of repair work deals with code-switching problems?

Finally, there needs to be much more research on extralinguistic features. This could include a study of the cultural differences in gestures and the problems in code-switching. There was also an indication in my data, that there may be differences in gestures according to sex, since the women tended to be more animated than the men. It would also be helpful, if research was conducted on the types of extralinguistic features which accompany specific speech acts, such as convincing, lying, arguing, etc., as well as on the types of extralinguistic features which accompany the regulations of turn-taking, topic shifting and nominating, and closings.

This type of research might add to our understanding of how learners use repair in dealing with problems in their conversations with each other.

FOOTNOTES

Chapter 1

[1] The organization of conversation, including turn-taking and repair, has been an interest of sociologists Schegloff, Sacks, and Jefferson for many years. In the process of writing about their findings, terminology specific to conversation analysis has been developed, although most terms are self-evident. Some of the terminology which needs to be explained, for the purposes of analysis is included in a glossary in the appendix. A better understanding of the organization of turn-taking and its terminology can be attained in reading "A Simplest Systematics: The Organization of Turn-Taking in Conversation," by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974).

Chapter 2

[1] Future researchers should be aware of some of the qualifications for examining data in terms of conversational analysis. The most valuable resource for this kind of research are accurate transcripts. However, transcription techniques developed for conversational analysis demand tremendous patience, perception, and time. The frustrations of working with inaccurate transcripts are universal, but very few people are willing to devote all the time and patience which good transcripts require. It must be stressed that no transcript is ever perfect (my own included) and they are revised with each new hearing. Therefore, the original audio- and videotapes must be constantly referred to.

Chapter 4

[1] In neurolinguistic studies gaze direction has been shown to be helpful in identifying the dominant brain hemisphere in individuals (Hartnett, 1975; Krashen, Seliger and Hartnett, 1974). It would be interesting to note the direction of eye gaze during "uh's" and word searches, after having established hemispheric learning modalities for the students (using the CLEM test) to see if there is any correlation.

[2] It would be interesting to look at lexical search from a neurolinguistic point of view, to see if it is dominated by the right hemisphere. If there was a switch of modalities from the language-centered left hemisphere to the Gestalt-oriented right hemisphere, it might have some relevance in explaining the wide array of extralinguistic behavior and iconic gestures which accompany word searches.

Chapter 5

1

It would be interesting to conduct a type of contrastive analysis on the discourse function of agreement and continuers for Japanese, in order to see if these are distinct and if signs of agreement are called for more often than in English.

2

Diane Larsen-Freeman and Virginia Strom (1977) have reported on research in progress on an index of development based on discourse tasks, both written and oral.

Chapter 6

1

Any attempt to summarize this paper is apt not to do it justice and may lead to confusion. However, for the purposes of comparison, such a summary is necessary. For clarification, readers are urged to read the original document.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allwright, R. Problems in the study of the language teacher's treatment of learner error. In M. Burt and H. Dulay, (Eds.) New Directions in Second Language Learning, Teaching and Bilingual Education, Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1975.

Allwright, R. Turns, topics, and tasks: A pilot investigation for a case-study approach to classroom language learning. Paper presented at 11th Annual TESOL Convention, Miami Beach, April, 1977.

Brunak, J., Fain, E. and Schwartz, J. Conversations between second language learners. Unpublished English 199 paper, UCLA, 1976.

Chaudron, C. Teachers' priorities in correcting learners' errors in French immersion classes. Working Papers On Bilingualism, 1977, 12, 21-44.

Coulthard, M. Discourse analysis in English - a short review of the literature. Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts, 1975, 8, 2, 73-89.

Daden, I. Conversational analysis and its relevance to the teaching of English as a second language. Unpublished MATESL thesis, UCLA, 1975.

Duncan, S. On the structure of speaker-auditor interaction during speaking turns. Language in Society, 1974, 3, 2, 161-80.

Duncan, S. Language, paralanguage, and body motion in the structure of conversations. In W. McCormack and S. Wurm, (Eds.) Language and Man. Anthropological Issues. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.

Engel, W. von Raffler. Linguistic and kinesic correlations in code-switching. In W. McCormack and S. Wurm, (Eds.) Language and Man. Anthropological Issues. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.

Gaskill, W. Conversational analysis in adult native speaker - non-native speaker interaction. Unpublished MATESL thesis, UCLA, 1977.

Goodwin, C. The construction of the turn at talk as an interactive process. Unpublished mimeo. University of Pennsylvania, undated.

Hartnett, D. The relation of cognitive style and hemispheric preference to deductive and inductive second language learning. Unpublished MATESL thesis, UCLA, 1975.

Hatch, E. Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch, (Ed.) Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House (in press).

Hatch, E., Shapira, R., and Wagner-Gough, J. Foreigner talk: making it easier. Paper presented at the USC-UCLA Second Language Acquisition Forum, October, 1975.

Jefferson, G. Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.) Studies in Social Interaction. New York: The Free Press, 1972.

Jefferson, G. Error correction as an interactional resource. Language in Society, 1974, 3, 181-99.

Jordan, B. and Fuller, N. On the non-fatal nature of trouble: sense-making and trouble-managing in lingua franca talk. Semiotica, 1975, 13, 1, 11-32.

Kendon, A. Some functions of gaze direction in social interaction. Acta Psychologica, 1967, 26, 1-47.

Kendon, A. Some relationships between body motion and speech. In Siegman and Pope, (Eds.) Studies in Dyadic Communication, New York: Pergamon Press, 1972.

Krashen, S., Seliger, H., and Hartnett, D. Two studies in adult second language learning. Kritikon Litterarum, 1974, 3, 220-28.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and Strom, V. The construction of a second language acquisition index of development. Language Learning, 1977, 27, 1.

Moerman, M. Analysis of Lue conversation: providing accounts, finding breaches, and taking sides. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), Studies in Social Interaction. New York: The Free Press, 1972.

Moerman, M. and Sacks, H. On understanding in the analysis of natural conversation. In Kinkade, M. (Ed.) Relations of Anthropology and Linguistics. The Hague: Mouton, (forthcoming).

Peck, S. Child - child discourse in second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.) Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House (in press).

Robbins, M. Error explanations: a procedure for examining written interlanguage performance. Unpublished MATESL thesis, UCLA, 1977.

Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E. Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In N. Avison and R. Wilson (Eds.) Ethnomethodology, Labelling Theory, and Deviant Behavior. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. and Jefferson G. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. Language, 1974, 50, 4, 696-735.

Schegloff, E. Sequencing in conversational openings. American Anthropologist, 1968, 70, 1075-95.

Schegloff, E. Recycled turn beginnings: a precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. Unpublished mimeo., 1973.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language, June, 1977.
(page numbers in text refer to the unpublished mimeo.)

Schlue, K. Socorro and Samporn. Unpublished E.S.L. 272 paper, UCLA, 1975.

Schlue, K. An inside view of interlanguage: consulting the adult learner about the second language acquisition process. Unpublished MATESL thesis, UCLA, 1976.

Slama-Cazacu, T. Nonverbal components in message sequence: "Mixed syntax." In W. McCormack and S. Wurm, (Eds.) Language and Man. Anthropological Issues. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.

Wagner-Gough, J. Comparative studies in second language learning. Unpublished MATESL thesis, UCLA, 1975.

Yngve, V. Human linguistics and face-to-face interaction. In A. Kendon, R. Harris and M. Key, (Eds.) Organization of Behavior in Face-to-Face Interaction. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

APPENDIX A
TRANSCRIPTION KEY

(.)	pause of less than one tenth of a second
(1.5)	pauses in tenths of seconds
=	"latching"; no interval between the end of a prior turn and the start of the next.
th-	hyphen after a word or partial word indicates self-interruption or a cut-off.
.h	inbreath (before voice onset)
Bowman	underscoring indicates stressed segments, involving pitch and volume
[Well uh- [mm hmm]	brackets indicate overlapped speech. The first bracket indicates where one speaker's speech starts to overlap the other's speech. The second bracket shows where the overlapped speech ends.
? , .	puncutation marks are not grammatical, but are used as intonation markers. A question mark shows rising intonation
Uh: we:::ll	colons indicate that the prior syllable is prolonged
(hh)	this symbol within a word indicates laughter.
°Yeah	°indicates low volume
(develop- ment in the country)	single parentheses around words indicate that the transcribers are not sure about the words within.
clithes waship idear Watcha doin?	regular orthography is used to indicate pronunciation, rather than phonetic transcription (because almost everything would have to then be transcribed phonetically to be consistent).
Natasha:	|raises hand ⟶ extralinguistic features onset point I want to go ⟶ transcribed speech

A single vertical bar indicates the onset point of extralinguistic features to the corresponding speech.

APPENDIX B

GLOSSARY

turn	the speech one person utters before another person starts talking
turn constructional unit (TCU)	the units out of which a turn may be constructed. The major types are lexical ("yeah"), phrasal ("in the morning?"), clausal ("where the sidewalk is?"), or sentential ("I read this book yesterday").
transition space or transition relevant place	the space at the end of a TCU, in which transfer of a turn to another speaker can take place.
gap	silence between turns
overlap	two or more people speaking at the same time.
repairable or trouble source	that which causes trouble with the hearing or understanding of a turn.
repair initiation	initiating some type of correction on a trouble source, e.g., "What?"
self-repair	the speaker of the trouble source attempts to repair it himself.
other-repair	another person from the one who said the trouble source attempts to repair the trouble source.
cut-off	speech which is interrupted, word endings are cut off abruptly.
sound stretch	the elongation of segmental phonemes
word search	the search for a referent
speech preparatory gestures	gestures which signal the intention to talk (e.g., a posture shift, lips parting)
speech-accompanying gestures	gestures which respond in rhythm to the rhythmic intonation of speech.

iconic gestures	gestures which mime or act out words (e.g., spelling the letter "R" with an index finger while saying "R")
preference	sequence and turn organizational features which favor the use of one feature over another. Preference does not refer to a speaker's motivation
continuer	words which show that the auditor understands what is being said and the speaker can continue, e.g., "mm hmm," "yeah," "oh," etc.